arXiv:1606.08298v1 [stat.ME] 27 Jun 2016

Multivariate normal inverse Gaussian Matérn fields

David Bolin[1] and Jonas Wallin[2]
[1]Department of Mathematical Sciences, Chalmers and University of Gothenburg
[2]Department of Statistics, Lund University

Abstract: We present a new class of multivariate random fields with Matérn covariance functions and with multivariate marginal distributions that are more flexible than the Gaussian distribution. The fields are obtained as solutions to systems of stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs) driven by normal inverse Gaussian (NIG) noise. We show that there are many different multivariate differential operators that result in equivalent multivariate random fields if Gaussian noise is used in the SPDEs, and characterise a class of such equivalent operators. In combination with NIG noise this class defines a class of multivariate random fields with equivalent cross-covariance structure but different multivariate marginal distributions, whose shape are controlled by parameters in the operator. The models are incorporated in a geostatistical setting with measurement errors and covariates, and a computationally efficient likelihood-based parameter estimation method is derived. Finally, we show that the models have better predictive performance than standard Gaussian models for a popular multivariate geostatistical dataset.

Key words: Geostatistics; Stochastic partial differential equations; Markov random fields

1 Introduction

Developing models for multivariate random fields has been an active research area in recent years. The research is motivated by an increasing number of spatial datasets with multiple variables, such as different climate variables measured as weather stations, various pollutants monitored in urban areas, or climate model outputs. The great majority of the work on multivariate random fields has focused on Gaussian random fields. Yet, many datasets possess features that cannot be captured by Gaussian models, such as exponential tails or asymmetric marginal distributions, and there is a need for multivariate random fields with more general distributions than the Gaussian.

There are a few attempts to construct non-Gaussian multivariate models in the literature. For example, Genton et al. (2015) considered multivariate max-stable processes for spatial extremes and Ma (2013a) introduced multivariate Mittag-Leffler random fields. Another approach for constructing non-Gaussian fields is to view a Gaussian field with a prior on the marginal variance as a non-Gaussian random field. Multivariate versions of this approach are presented by Ma (2013b) and Du et al. (2012). The problem with these approaches is that they are either too limited, in the sense that they cannot capture essential features such as sample path asymmetry, or that they lack methods for practical applications. In fact, the creation of practically useful non-Gaussian multivariate random fields is listed as an open problem in the recent review article about multivariate random fields by Genton and Kleiber (2015). The purpose of this work is therefore to propose a new class of multivariate random fields, which is flexible enough to be of interest as an alternative to standard Gaussian models, and to derive the methods needed for practical application of the models.

A main theme in the research on multivariate random fields has been to construct valid multivariate cross-covariance functions that can be used to specify Gaussian random fields. Of particular interest has been to find multivariate extensions of the Matérn covariance function (Matérn, 1960), which is arguably the most widely used parametric covariance function. The Matérn correlation function is defined as

$$M\left(\mathbf{h} \mid \kappa, \nu\right) = \frac{1}{2^{\nu-1}\Gamma(\nu)} \left(\kappa\|\mathbf{h}\|\right)^{\nu} K_{\nu}\left(\kappa\|\mathbf{h}\|\right) \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, K_ν is a modified Bessel function of the second kind, $\nu > 0$ is a smoothness parameter that determines the differentiability of the covariance function, and $\kappa > 0$ is a scaling parameter that determines the correlation range. The Matérn covariance function was extended to the multivariate setting by Gneiting et al. (2012). The authors proposed a covariance model for a p-dimensional random field that has marginal Matérn correlations $\rho_{ii}(\mathbf{h}) = M\left(\mathbf{h} \mid \kappa_{ii}, \nu_{ii}\right)$ as well as Matérn cross-correlations $\rho_{ij}(\mathbf{h}) = \beta_{ij} M\left(\mathbf{h} \mid \kappa_{ij}, \nu_{ij}\right)$. Here i and j enumerates the p dimensions and β_{ij} determines the cross-correlations between the different variables. A difficulty with this construction is to determine conditions for the parameters ν_{ij} and κ_{ij} so that the model is a valid non-negative definite multivariate covariance function. Gneiting et al. (2012) proposed two main models, a parsimonious model where $\kappa_{ij} \equiv \kappa$ and $\nu_{ij} = (\nu_{ii} + \nu_{jj})/2$, as well as more general bivariate model. Later, Apanasovich et al. (2012) introduced a more flexible multivariate Matérn model, that relaxed the restrictions of the parsimonious Matérn fields for $p > 2$.

Because of the popularity of the Gaussian Matérn fields, our aim is to construct a class of models with Matérn covariance functions for each dimension and with more flexible multivariate marginal distributions than the Gaussian. It is difficult to use the covariance-based representation to define non-Gaussian Matérn fields, and we will instead base the model class on a multivariate extension of the non-Gaussian Matérn fields proposed by Bolin (2014) and Wallin and Bolin (2015). The non-Gaussian Matérn fields have Matérn covariance functions, but are specified as solutions to stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs). Thus, our models will be formulated as a multivariate extension to SPDE-based models, which will be achieved by considering solutions to systems of SPDEs. An important feature of this approach is that the resulting models posses Markov properties that be explored to decrease the computational cost of using the models. This makes the models applicable in "Big N" scenarios, where the datasets are so large that it prohibits the use of standard covariance-based models.

Hu et al. (2013) and Hu and Steinsland (2016) used systems of SPDEs to generate multivariate Gaussian random field models. However, they did not pursue the idea in much detail, and only considered Gaussian models that not necessarily had Matérn covariance functions. We will review the SPDE-based approach to constructing Gaussian Matérn fields in Section 2, and introduce the multivariate extension that is the focus of this work. We will also provide a sufficient condition on the operators used equations to guarantee that the solutions have marginal Matérn covariances.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The non-Gaussian extension of the multivariate SPDE models is introduced in Section 3. The extension is based on replacing the Gaussian white noise in the SPDEs with normal inverse Gaussian (NIG) noise. Some basic properties are shown and the characteristic function for the multivariate marginal distributions is derived for the models. The bivariate case is considered in more detail in Section 4, where examples of marginal distributions and covariance functions are shown. Section 5 discusses the model discretization needed for practical applications of the models, which are based on finite element approximations of the SPDEs. Section 6 incorporates the multivariate fields in a standard geostatistical model and derives a likelihood-based parameter estimation method. The section also shows how to do spatial prediction and how to evaluation of predictive performance for the models. Section 7 presents an application to a bivariate dataset consisting of pressure and

temperature observations. The Gaussian and non-Gaussian SPDE models are compared with standard covariance-based Gaussian Matérn models. The article concludes with a discussion in Section 8. Proofs and technical details are collected in the appendices.

2 Multivariate Matérn fields and systems of SPDEs

A Gaussian random field with a Matérn covariance function can be represented as a stationary solution to the stochastic partial differential equation

$$(\kappa^2 - \Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} x(\mathbf{s}) = \mathcal{W}, \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\alpha = \nu + d/2$, Δ is the Laplacian and $\mathcal{W}$ is Gaussian white noise. As pointed out by (Lindgren et al., 2011), the kernel of the operator $\mathcal{K} = (\kappa^2 - \Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ is non-trivial for $\alpha \geq 2$ and there is an implicit assumption of boundary conditions in the equation as we are only interested in the stationary solutions. We discuss these and other more technical details in Appendix B.

Extending equation (2) to a system of SPDEs can be used to define more general covariance models (Bolin and Lindgren, 2011) and to define multivariate random fields. Hu et al. (2013) and later Hu and Steinsland (2016) proposed using systems of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{K}_{11} & \mathcal{K}_{12} & \cdots & \mathcal{K}_{1p} \\ \mathcal{K}_{21} & \mathcal{K}_{22} & \cdots & \mathcal{K}_{2p} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathcal{K}_{p1} & \mathcal{K}_{p2} & \cdots & \mathcal{K}_{pp} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1(s) \\ x_2(s) \\ \vdots \\ x_p(s) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{W}_1 \\ \mathcal{W}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{W}_p \end{bmatrix}, \tag{3}$$

to construct multivariate random fields, where $\mathcal{K}_{ij}$ are pseudo-differential operators such as $(\kappa^2 - \Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$. Denoting the multivariate process $(x_1(\mathbf{s}), \ldots, x_p(\mathbf{s}))^T$ by $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$ and introducing the multivariate white noise process $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}} = (\mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{s}), \ldots, \mathcal{W}_p(\mathbf{s}))^T$ allows us to write (3) more compactly as

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{K}}\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s}) = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}, \tag{4}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{K}}$ is the operator matrix with entries $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{K}}_{ij} = \mathcal{K}_{ij}$.

Although Hu et al. (2013) formulated the general p-dimensional system above, they focused on the bivariate triangular system

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{K}_{11} & \mathcal{K}_{12} \\ & \mathcal{K}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1(s) \\ x_2(s) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{W}_1 \\ \mathcal{W}_2 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{5}$$

where $\mathcal{K}_{ij} = (\kappa_{ij}^2 - \Delta)^{\frac{\alpha_{ij}}{2}}$. To better understand the covariance structure, we can informally invert (see Appendix B for details and a more precise treatment) the operator matrix to obtain

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1(s) \\ x_2(s) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{K}_{11}^{-1} & -\mathcal{K}_{11}^{-1}\mathcal{K}_{12}\mathcal{K}_{22}^{-1} \\ & \mathcal{K}_{22}^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{W}_1 \\ \mathcal{W}_2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{6}$$

From this representation one can see that the marginal covariance structure of x_2 is completely determined by the operator $\mathcal{K}_{22}$, whereas x_1 is the sum of two Gaussian fields. If one, as Hu et al. (2013), uses $\mathcal{K}_{ij} = (\kappa_{ij}^2 - \Delta)^{\frac{\alpha_{ij}}{2}}$, then x_2 is marginally a Gaussian Matérn field whereas x_1 has a more complicated covariance structure. Note that the differentiability of $\mathbf{x}$ is increased by increasing α_{11} and α_{22}, whereas it decreases if α_{12} is increased.

Although the full system of equations (3) may be of interest, the great generality comes of the cost of a great number of parameters that may be difficult to identify in practice. We will instead focus on the slightly more restrictive case when all marginal covariances are Matérn,

and will now focus on characterizing systems of SPDEs that result in models of this kind. Investigating (6), we can note that x_1 has a Matérn covariance if $\mathcal{K}_{12} = \mathcal{K}_{22}$. In this case, the covariance structure of x_1 is determined by the operator $2\mathcal{K}_{11}$, and the cross covariance is determined by $-\mathcal{K}_{11}^{-1}\mathcal{K}_{22}^{-1}$. This observation is the motivation behind the following definition of the triangular Matérn SPDE.

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathcal{L}_i = \tau_i(\kappa_i^2 - \Delta)^{\frac{\alpha_i}{2}}$. The solution to the p-variate system of equations

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{L}_1 & D_{12}\mathcal{L}_2 & D_{13}\mathcal{L}_3 & \cdots & D_{1p}\mathcal{L}_p \\ & \mathcal{L}_2 & D_{23}\mathcal{L}_3 & \cdots & D_{2p}\mathcal{L}_p \\ & & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & & \mathcal{L}_{p-1} & D_{p-1p}\mathcal{L}_p \\ & & & & \mathcal{L}_p \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1(s) \\ x_2(s) \\ \vdots \\ x_{p-1}(s) \\ x_p(s) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{W}_1 \\ \mathcal{W}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathcal{W}_{p-1} \\ \mathcal{W}_p \end{bmatrix}, \tag{7}$$

is defined as a triangular Matérn-SPDE field with parameters $(\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_p) \in \mathbb{R}_+^p$,$(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_p) \in \mathbb{R}_+^p$, and $(D_{12}, \ldots, D_{p-1p}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p(p+1)/2}$.

That this system of equations can be used to defined a multivariate Gaussian field with marginal Matérn covariances is clarified in the following proposition.

Proposition 2.2. *Define the matrix* $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{D}_u^{-1}$*, where*

$$\mathbf{D}_u = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & D_{12} & D_{13} & \cdots & D_{1p} \\ & 1 & D_{23} & \cdots & D_{2p} \\ & & \ddots & & \vdots \\ & & & 1 & D_{p-1p} \\ & & & & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

and let $\tau_i^2 = \sigma_i^{-2}\Gamma(\alpha_i)^{-1}(4\pi)^{-d/2}\kappa_i^{-2\nu_i}\Gamma(\nu_i)\sum_{j=1}^p R_{ij}^2$*. Then, given that* $\mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{s}), \ldots, \mathcal{W}_p(\mathbf{s})$ *are mutually independent white noise processes, a stationary solution* $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$ *to* (7) *has marginal Matérn covariance functions,* $\mathrm{Cov}(x_i(s), x_i(t)) = \sigma_i^2 M\left(\|s-t\| \mid \kappa_i, \nu_i\right)$*. The cross-covariance function* $\mathrm{Corr}(x_i(s), x_j(t))$ *is obtained by inverting the cross power spectrum*

$$S_{ij}(k) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^p R_{ik}R_{jk}}{(2\pi)^d\tau_i\tau_j} \frac{1}{(\kappa_i^2 + \|k\|^2)^{\frac{\alpha_i}{2}}(\kappa_j^2 + \|k\|^2)^{\frac{\alpha_j}{2}}}. \tag{8}$$

The proof is given in Appendix B. Note that the strength of the cross-correlations are determined by the D_{ij} parameters and that the cross-covariances $\mathrm{Cov}(x_i(s), x_i(t))$ are not Matérn unless $\kappa_j = \kappa_j$. In some cases one can compute the cross-covariances functions, however they involve integrals involving Bessel functions and we do not explore this further since the exact form the cross-covariances seems to be of little interest in general.

Now, two natural questions are if there exists a larger class of non-triangular operator matrices that result in marginal Matérn covariances, and if so if anything can be gained by considering that class. The following proposition answers these questions.

Proposition 2.3. *A stationary solution to the p-variate system in Equation* (4) *has marginal Matérn covariances whenever the operator matrix is on the form* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{K}} = \mathbf{D}\,\mathrm{diag}(\mathcal{L}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_p)$*, where* $\mathbf{D}$ *is some real* $p \times p$ *matrix. For any such system, the cross-power spectrums of the solution is on the form given in Equation* (8) *with* $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{D}^{-1}$*. For Gaussian noise* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$*, two models defined* (4) *with operator matrices* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{K}} = \mathbf{D}\,\mathrm{diag}(\mathcal{L}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_p)$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{K}} = \hat{\mathbf{D}}\,\mathrm{diag}(\mathcal{L}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_p)$ *respectively are equivalent if and only if* $\mathbf{D}^T\mathbf{D} = \hat{\mathbf{D}}^T\hat{\mathbf{D}}$*.*

See Appendix B for the proof of the proposition. Because the matrix $\mathbf{D}$ is not completely identifiable from data for Gaussian models, one does not gain anything by considering a non-triangular $\mathbf{D}$. However, this is not the case for non-Gaussian models, and we will later use the additional flexibility in allowing for non-triangular $\mathbf{D}$ to define more general models. We can also use the proposition to derive the following corollary that gives two alternative characterization of the multivariate Matérn SPDEs.

Corollary 2.4. *A multivariate SPDE-field with marginal Matérn covariances can be obtained as a solution a diagonal system* $\operatorname{diag}(\mathcal{L}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_p)\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s}) = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\Sigma$*, where* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\Sigma(s)$ *is a vector-valued white noise process with*

$$\mathsf{C}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}(s), \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}(t)) = \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} & s = t \\ 0 & s \neq t. \end{cases}$$

Here Σ *is a covariance matrix that can be written as* $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{R}^T$ *where* $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{D}^{-1}$*. Equivalently,* $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$ *can be written as the solution of* p *one-dimensional SPDEs*

$$\mathcal{L}_i x_i(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{k=1}^{p} R_{ik}\, \mathcal{W}_k(\mathbf{s}), \quad i = 1, \ldots, p.$$

3 Multivariate Normal inverse Gaussian random fields

Following the work by Bolin (2014) and Wallin and Bolin (2015), we extend the multivariate SPDE models by replacing the Gaussian noise in the SPDEs with vector valued type-G Lévy noise $\dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}}$. We define a p-dimensional multivariate type-G field $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$ using the representation given in Proposition 2.3,

$$\mathbf{D}\operatorname{diag}(\mathcal{L}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_p)\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s}) = \dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}}, \tag{9}$$

where we now have to define $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}$. A univariate Lévy process is of type G if its increments can be represented as a Gaussian variance mixture $V^{1/2}Z$ where Z is a standard Gaussian variable and V is a non-negative infinitely divisible random variable. For compact domains $D \in \mathbb{R}^2$, Rosiński (1991) showed that such processes can be written as $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} Z_k g(e_k)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{s} \geq \mathbf{s}_k)$, where the function g is the generalized inverse of the tail Lévy measure for V, Z_k are iid $\mathsf{N}(0,1)$ random variables, e_k are iid standard exponential random variables, $\mathbf{s}_k$ are iid uniform random variables on D, and $\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{s} \geq \mathbf{s}_k)$ is a two-dimensional indicator function, $\mathbb{I}(\mathbf{s} \geq \mathbf{s}_k) = \mathbb{I}(s_1 \geq s_{k,1})\mathbb{I}(s_2 \geq s_{k,2})$. The non-decreasing Lévy process $V(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} g(e_k)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{s} \geq \mathbf{s}_k)$ has increments with the same distribution as V, and could informally be thought of as a process that determines the variance of the noise. For multivariate processes, there are two natural extensions to vector valued noise that we collect in the following definition.

Definition 3.1. A vector valued type-G process is $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}} = [\mathcal{M}_1, \cdots, \mathcal{M}_p]^T$, where $\mathcal{M}_1, \ldots \mathcal{M}_p$ are independent type-G processes. A restricted vector valued type-G process is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}_R = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} g(e_k)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{I}(\mathbf{s} \geq \mathbf{s}_k)\mathbf{Z}_k \tag{10}$$

where $\mathbf{Z}_k$ are independent $\mathsf{N}(0, \mathbf{I})$ variables.

Thus, the regular construction of a vector valued type-G processes is simply a vector of independent univariate processes, whereas the restricted construction uses a common variance process. An interesting feature of the restricted approach in the SPDE construction is shown in the following proposition.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $p = 2$ and let $x_1(\mathbf{s})$ and $x_2(\mathbf{s})$ be random fields defined as a stationary solution to* (9) *where* $\mathbf{D}$ *is diagonal and the right-hand side is given by* (10)*. Then, for any* $(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t})$ *in the domain,* $x_1(\mathbf{s})$ *and* $x_2(\mathbf{t})$ *are dependent random variables with with* $\mathrm{Cov}(x_1(\mathbf{s}), x_2(\mathbf{t})) = 0$.

The proof is given in Appendix B. The restricted approach could be of interest for applications where one wish to capture dependence of the extreme values on different variables, but we will not investigate it further here.

Following Wallin and Bolin (2015), we focus on the normal inverse Gaussian (NIG) process (Barndorff-Nielsen, 1997), which we denote by $\mathcal{N}$. When using NIG noise in equation (9), it is convenient note that the noise is an independently scattered random measure (for a definition, see Rajput and Rosinski, 1989). For any Borel set A in the domain, the measure is a random variable with probability density function

$$f_{\dot{\mathcal{N}}(A)}(x) = \frac{m(A)\gamma\sqrt{\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^2}+\gamma^2}}{\pi c(A,x)} e^{m(A)\gamma^2+\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2}(x-m(A)\delta)} \cdot K_1\left(c(A,x)\sqrt{\frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^4}+\frac{\gamma^2}{\sigma^2}}\right),$$

where $c(A,x) = \sqrt{m(A)^2\gamma^2\sigma^2 + (x-m(A)\delta)^2}$, $\delta, \mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+$, and $m(A)$ denotes the Lebesgue measure of A. Since we will use the NIG process only as driving noise for the SPDE (9), we from now on set $\sigma = 1$, as the variance of the processes $x_k(s)$ will be parameterized using the variables τ_k in the differential operator. The NIG random variable $\dot{\mathcal{N}}(A)$ can then be represented as $\dot{\mathcal{N}}(A) = m(A)\delta + \mu V + \sqrt{V}Z$, where $Z \sim \mathsf{N}(0,1)$ and V has an inverse Gaussian distribution with probability density function

$$f_V(x) = \frac{m(A)\gamma}{\sqrt{2\pi x^3}} \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2}{2}x - \frac{m(A)^2\gamma^2}{2x} + m(A)\gamma^2\right).$$

We denote the inverse Gaussian distribution by $IG(x; \gamma^2, m(A)^2\gamma^2)$.

We let $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{N}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{N}}_R$ denote the vector-valued processes in Definition 3.1 when NIG process are used. Of interest is now the distribution of $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$ when the driving noise is given by $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{N}}$ in (9). The density of $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$ does not have an explicit form in this case; however, one can derive the characteristic function of $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$ and this can be used to compute the density numerically.

Theorem 3.3. *The characteristic function of a stationary solution* $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$ *to* (9)*, where the driving noise is* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{N}}$*, is* $\phi_{\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})}(\mathbf{u}) = \prod_{k=1}^{p} \phi_k(\mathbf{u})$ *where*

$$\phi_k(\mathbf{u}) = \left[-i\delta_k \int \mathbf{v}_k(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{t})d\mathbf{t} + \gamma_k \int \left(\gamma_k^2 - \sqrt{\gamma_k^2 - 2i\mu_k^2\mathbf{v}_k(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{t}) + \mathbf{v}_k(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{t})\mathbf{v}_k(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{t})^T}\right) d\mathbf{t}\right].$$

Here $\mathbf{v}_k(\mathbf{u},\mathbf{t}) = \mathbf{u}^T[R_{1k}G_1(\mathbf{s},\mathbf{t}), R_{2k}G_2(\mathbf{s},\mathbf{t}), \ldots, R_{pk}G_p(\mathbf{s},\mathbf{t})]^T$, $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{D}^{-1}$*, and*

$$G_k(\mathbf{s},\mathbf{t}) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_k - d}{2}\right)}{\tau_k(4\pi)^{d/2}\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_k}{2})\kappa_k^{\alpha_k - d}} M\left(\|\mathbf{s}-\mathbf{t}\| \mid \kappa_k, \frac{\alpha_k - d}{2}\right), \quad k = 1, \ldots, p.$$

See Appendix B.5 for a proof. In the next section, we will use the proposition to compute the density functions for a few bivariate examples.

4 A class of bivariate NIG Matérn fields

The simplest example of multivariate NIG Matérn fields is given by the bivariate fields. For $p = 2$, the triangular Matérn SPDE is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1+D^2}\tau_1(\kappa_1^2 - \Delta)^{\frac{\alpha_1}{2}} & D\tau_2(\kappa_2^2 - \Delta)^{\frac{\alpha_2}{2}} \\ & \tau_2(\kappa_2^2 - \Delta)^{\frac{\alpha_2}{2}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} x_1(\mathbf{s}) \\ x_2(\mathbf{s}) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \dot{\mathcal{N}}_1 \\ \dot{\mathcal{N}}_2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{11}$$



Figure 1: Example of covariance functions for the solution to the triangular Matérn-SPDE with $\tau_1 = 0.4$, $\tau_2 = 0.28$, $D = -0.5$, $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 1$, $\alpha_1 = 1.5$, and $\alpha_2 = 2$.

Here we have used a slightly different parametrization than in Definition 2.1, where $\mathcal{L}_1$ has been multiplied by $\sqrt{1+D^2}$ in order to make the variance of x_1 independent of D. An example of cross-covariance functions for this case can be seen in Figure 1.

A natural alternative to the upper-triangular operator is a lower-triangular operator. The two triangular operators can be written as $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{K}} = \mathbf{D}_u \operatorname{diag}(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2)$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{K}} = \mathbf{D}_l \operatorname{diag}(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2)$, where

$$\mathbf{D}_u = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{1+D^2} & D \\ & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \mathbf{D}_l = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \\ D & \sqrt{1+D^2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathbf{D}_u^T \mathbf{D}_u = \mathbf{D}_l^T \mathbf{D}_l$, and Gaussian models defined by $\mathbf{D}_u$ and $\mathbf{D}_l$ are therefore equivalent by Proposition 2.3. This is not the case for non-Gaussian models, and we therefore may want to take advantage of the additional flexibility in allowing for different operator matrices. To that extent, we define a more flexible bivariate model by introducing

$$\mathbf{D}(a) = a\mathbf{D}_u + \frac{-a + \sqrt{1+D^2(1-a^2)}}{\sqrt{1+D^2}} \mathbf{D}_l,$$

where $a \in \mathbb{R}$. For $a = 1$ we have $\mathbf{D}(a) = \mathbf{D}_u$ and for $a = 0$ we have $\mathbf{D}(a) = \mathbf{D}_l$, and it is easy to verify that $\mathbf{D}(a)^T \mathbf{D}(a) = \mathbf{D}_u^T \mathbf{D}_u = \mathbf{D}_l^T \mathbf{D}_l$ for any value of a. Because of this, the cross-covariance structure obtained from a model that is specified by $\mathbf{D}(a)$ is independent of the parameter a. We denote the solution to

$$\mathbf{D}(a) \operatorname{diag}(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2) \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s}) = \dot{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{N}}} \tag{12}$$

as the general bivariate NIG Matérn model. The parameter a determines the shape of the bivariate marginal distributions of the solutions to (12), which can be computed using Proposition 3.3 with $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{D}(a)^{-1}$. See Figure 2 for examples of bivariate marginal distributions for different values of a. In the figure, all parameters but a are kept fixed to those that was used in Figure 1, which means that all six examples have the covariance and cross-covariance structure shown in Figure 1.

5 Finite-dimensional representations

An advantage with the SPDE approach is that Hilbert space approximations can be used to define computationally efficient representations of the models. This was introduced by Lindgren



Figure 2: Marginal distributions of general bivariate NIG Matérn fields. The different panels show marginal distributions of solutions to (12) for different values of a. All other model parameters are kept fixed, so that all examples have the same covariance and cross covariance functions, which are shown in Figure 1.

et al. (2011) for Gaussian models and was later extended to SPDEs driven by type-G Lévy noise by Bolin (2014). In this section, we review the univariate construction for a problem $\mathcal{L}x(\mathbf{s}) = \mathcal{W}$ with $\mathcal{L} = \tau(\kappa - \Delta)^{\alpha/2}$, and then introduce the simple multivariate extension.

In the univariate case, the method is based on a basis expansion $x(s) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} w_j \varphi_j(s)$, where $\{\varphi_j\}$ is a collection of piecewise linear basis functions obtained by some triangulation of the domain of interest. See Figure 3 for an example of a triangulation. Each node $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j$ in the triangulation defines a piecewise linear basis function $\varphi_j(\mathbf{s})$ with $\varphi_j(\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j) = 1$ that is zero for all locations in triangles not directly connected to the node $\tilde{\mathbf{s}}_j$.

The distribution of the stochastic weights $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \ldots, w_n)^\top$ can be formulated using mass matrix $\mathbf{C}$ with elements $C_{ii} = \langle \varphi_i, \varphi_i \rangle$ and the stiffness matrix $\mathbf{G}$ with elements $G_{ij} = \langle \nabla\varphi_i, \nabla\varphi_j \rangle$. Here $\langle f, g \rangle$ denotes the inner product on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and ∇ is the gradient operator. The matrix $\mathbf{L}_\alpha(\tau, \kappa) = \tau\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{C}^{-1}\mathbf{G} + \kappa^2\mathbf{I})^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ is a discretization of the operator $\mathcal{L}$, and when the driving noise is Gaussian, we get that $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathsf{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{L}_\alpha^{-1}\mathbf{C}\mathbf{L}_\alpha^{-T})$. When the driving noise is NIG-distributed, let $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \ldots, v_n)$ be a vector with elements determined by the variance process and let let $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \ldots, h_n)$ where $h_i = \langle \varphi_i, 1 \rangle$. Then, $v_i \sim IG(v^2, (vh_i)^2)$ and we have $\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{v} \sim \mathsf{N}(\mathbf{L}_\alpha^{-1}(\delta\mathbf{h} + \mu\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{L}_\alpha^{-1}\,\mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{L}_\alpha^{-T})$.

Most often when the SPDE representation is used in practice, one uses a fixed smoothness parameter $\alpha = 2$, this is for example the default setting in the popular `R-INLA` software package (Lindgren and Rue, 2015). In this case the discretised operator simplifies to $\mathbf{L}_\alpha = \tau(\mathbf{G} + \kappa^2\mathbf{C})$. Since the basis functions have compact support, $\mathbf{L}_\alpha$ is a sparse matrix, and this allows us to use efficient sparse matrix techniques during inference, as explained further in the next section. The precision matrix for the weights in the Gaussian case is $\mathbf{L}_\alpha\mathbf{C}^{-1}\mathbf{L}_\alpha^T$. To make this matrix sparse, which is needed for efficient likelihood evaluations, one can approximate the mass matrix with a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements $C_{ii} = h_i$. This has little effect on the approximation when piecewise linear basis functions are used (Bolin and Lindgren, 2013) and we will therefore use the diagonal approximation of the mass matrix throughout this work.

For the multivariate extension, we assume that the SPDE is formulated using the representation in Proposition 2.3. Introduce p-dimensional basis functions $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^k(\mathbf{s}) = \varphi_i(s)\mathbf{e}_k$, where $\mathbf{e}_k$ is a p-dimensional vector with elements $(\mathbf{e}_k)_i = 0$ if $i \neq k$ and $(\mathbf{e}_k)_k = 1$. Using this basis, $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$ is discretized as

$$\mathbf{x}(s) = \sum_{j=1}^{n}\sum_{k=1}^{p} w_{ik}\boldsymbol{\varphi}_j^k(\mathbf{s}). \tag{13}$$

The distribution of the stochastic weights $\mathbf{w} = (w_{11}, \ldots, w_{n1}, w_{12}, \ldots, w_{n2}, \ldots, w_{np})^T$ is computed using the same finite element matrix transfer technique (FE-MTT) as Bolin (2014) used for the univariate case. We refer to Bolin (2014) for details on the FE-MTT technique for the univariate case, and omit the details of the straight-forward generalization to the multivariate case. Instead we only report the resulting discretization. The discretization of the operator $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{K}}$ can be written as

$$\mathbf{K} = (\mathbf{D}_p \otimes \mathbf{I}_n)\operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{L}_{\alpha_1}(\tau_1, \kappa_1), \ldots, \mathbf{L}_{\alpha_p}(\tau_p, \kappa_p)), \tag{14}$$

where $\mathbf{I}_n$ denotes an identity matrix of size $n \times n$. Similarly to the univariate case, one gets that $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathsf{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{K}^{-1}\operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{C}, \ldots, \mathbf{C})\mathbf{K}^{-T})$ in the case of Gaussian noise. For the NIG case, introduce $\mathbf{v}_k = (v_1^k, \ldots, v_n^k)$ as a vector with elements determined by the variance process of the kth dimension. Specifically, $v_i^k \sim IG(\gamma_k^2, (\gamma_k h_i)^2)$ and h_i^j is the integral of $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_i^j$. Furthermore, set $\mathbf{h}_k = (h_1^k, \ldots, h_n^k)$, $\mathbf{h} = (\mathbf{h}_1^T, \ldots, \mathbf{h}_p^T)^T$, and $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{v}_1^T, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_p^T)^T$. We then have that $\mathbf{v} \sim IG(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^2 \otimes \mathbf{1}_n, (\operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \otimes \mathbf{I}_n\mathbf{h})^2)$ and

$$\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{v} \sim \mathsf{N}(\mathbf{K}^{-1}((\operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \otimes \mathbf{I}_n)\mathbf{h} + (\operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \otimes \mathbf{I}_n)\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{K}^{-1}\operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{K}^{-T}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_k)^T$, $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k)^T$, and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_k)^T$. The notation for the distribution of $\mathbf{v}$ is simply a compact way of writing the distribution of a vector with independent components with different parameters.

6 Geostatistical modeling and estimation

For using the multivariate NIG random fields for geostatistical applications, it is desirable to be able to include them in hierarchical models that include covariates for the mean as well as measurement noise. In this section, we formulate such a hierarchical model and describe how to do maximum likelihood estimation of the model parameters. After this, we present how to use the model for spatial prediction as well as how to compute a popular scoring rule that can be used to assess model's predictive performance.

We formulate the model for a set of p-dimensional observations taken at locations $\mathbf{s}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{s}_n$. Let y_{ki} be the ith observation of the kth dimension, and let $\mathbf{z}_k(\mathbf{s})$ be the latent field for the kth dimension. We assume the likelihood $\mathbf{y}_{ki} = z_k(\mathbf{s}_i) + \sigma_k\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{ki}$ where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{ki}$ are independent standard Gaussian variables representing the measurement noise, which is assumed to have variance σ_k^2 for the kth dimension. The latent field is modeled as $z_k(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{j=1}^{K} B_j(\mathbf{s})\beta_j + x_k(\mathbf{s})$, for $k = 1, \ldots, p$. Here, the functions $B_j(\mathbf{s})$ are covariates for the mean of the latent field, and $x_k(\mathbf{s})$ is the kth variable of a mean-zero multivariate NIG Matérn field $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$. Using the finite-dimensional representation from Section 5 of $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$, the model can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{v} &\sim IG(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^2 \otimes \mathbf{1}_n, (\operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \otimes \mathbf{I}_n\mathbf{h})^2),\\
\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{v} &\sim \mathsf{N}\left(\mathbf{K}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu} \otimes \mathbf{I}_n)(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{h}), \mathbf{K}^{-1}\operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{K}^{-T}\right),\\
\mathbf{y}_k|\mathbf{w} &\sim \mathsf{N}\left(\mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{A}_k\mathbf{w}, \sigma_k^2\mathbf{I}\right),\ k = 1, \ldots, k,
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where $\mathbf{y}_k$ denotes the vector of all n observations of the kth dimension of the data. Note that we have set $\delta_k = -\mu_k$ in the model in order to guarantee that $x_k(\mathbf{s})$ has mean zero. The matrix $\mathbf{B}$ contains the covariates evaluated at the measurement locations and $\mathbf{A}_k = \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{e}_k) \otimes \mathbf{A}$.

Here $\mathbf{A}$ is the observation matrix that links the measurement locations to the random weights for the basis expansion of $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$, and thus has elements $\mathbf{A}_{ij} = \varphi_j(\mathbf{s}_i)$.

6.1 Parameter estimation

There is no explicit expression for the likelihood, $\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{y})$ where $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ denotes all model parameters, of the model (15). However, it is possible to compute maximum likelihood parameter estimates using Monte Carlo (MC) methods. Wallin and Bolin (2015) used a MC Expectation Maximization (MCEM) algorithm (Wei and Tanner, 1990) for estimating the parameters of a univariate version of the model. A problem with that method is that the MCEM algorithm requires the derivation of sufficient statistics that can be cumbersome to compute and which, potentially, require a lot storage. Furthermore, the maximization that is required in the M-step of the method often has to be done numerically, which can be computationally expensive. Because of this, we will here use a stochastic gradient (SG) method (Kushner and Yin, 2003; Andrieu et al., 2005) instead of the problematic MCEM algorithm.

The idea of SG is simple. One only needs an asymptotically unbiased estimator, $\mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, of the gradient of the likelihood in order to utilize the following iterative procedure to find a stationary point of the likelihood,

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(i)} = \alpha_i \mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(i-1)}) + \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(i-1)}, \tag{16}$$

where $\{\alpha_i\}$ is a sequence satisfying $\sum \alpha_i \to \infty$ and $\sum(\alpha_i)^2 < \infty$. The SG method avoids the problems of the MCEM algorithm since the gradient itself is a sufficient statistic for the SG method and since the M-step in the MCEM algorithm is replaced by the update step in equation (16), which never requires numerical maximization.

To derive the estimator of the gradient of the log-likelihood, we use that

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathsf{E}_{\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w}} \left(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}|\mathbf{y}) | \mathbf{y} \right), \tag{17}$$

which follows from a few lines of calculations. Furthermore, because of the structure of the model in (15), we have a closed-form expression for $\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}|\mathbf{y})$, see Appendix A. There exists no closed form expression for $\mathsf{E}_{\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w}}(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}|\mathbf{y}))$, so we formulate $\mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ as a MC estimate of the expectation, where we utilize a Gibbs sampler to sample from $\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}|\mathbf{y})$. Algorithm 1 describes an iteration of the Gibbs sampler. On Line 8 in the algorithm, GIG denotes Generalized inverse Gaussian distribution. An important fact here is that the components in $\mathbf{v}_k$ are independent, and one can therefore sample the vector efficiently (see Jørgensen, 1982, for details about the GIG distribution). On Line 4 and Line 5, one should not compute the inverse $\mathbf{Q}^{-1}$ but instead utilize efficient sampling method for Gaussian Markov random fields based on sparse Cholesky factorization (see Rue and Held, 2005).

The MC estimate of the expectation in (17) often has large variance, which results in slow convergence of the SG method. To reduce the variance we note that we can compute $\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{y}) = \int \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}|\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{w}$ analytically since $\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y})$ is Gaussian. We can therefore change the right hand side of (17) to $\mathsf{E}_{\mathbf{v}}(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{y})|\mathbf{y})$, and only use $\mathbf{w}$ in the Gibbs sampler to sample $\mathbf{v}$. Thus, the estimator of the gradient is $\mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{v}^{(i)}|\mathbf{y})$, where $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ are samples from the posterior distribution $\pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ obtained using the Gibbs sampler. The actual gradients $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \log \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{v}^{(i)}|\mathbf{y})$ are presented in Appendix A.

For the Application presented in Section 7, we estimated the parameters of the NIG models by running the algorithm for 1000 iterations, using start values for the parameters obtained from first fitting the corresponding Gaussian model using maximum likelihood. Running a MATLAB (2015) implementation of the algorithm for 1000 iterations for the general model in the application took 236 seconds on a Macbook Pro computer with a 2.6GHz Intel Core i7 processor (Apple Inc., Cupertino, CA, USA). Thus, by using the proposed estimation method, we only need a few minutes of computation time to fit the multivariate NIG Matérn fields to standard multivariate geostatistical datasets.

Algorithm 1 Gibbs sampler

procedure GIBBS($\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \mathbf{h}$)
  $\mathbf{K} \leftarrow \mathit{BuildOperator}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ (Construct $\mathbf{K}$ as outlined in Section 5)
  $\hat{\mathbf{Q}} \leftarrow \mathbf{K}^T \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{v})^{-1}\mathbf{K} + \sum_{k=1}^{p} \frac{1}{\sigma_k^2}\mathbf{A}_k^T\mathbf{A}_k$
  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} \leftarrow \hat{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{p} \frac{1}{\sigma_k^2}\mathbf{A}_k^T\mathbf{y}_k + \mathbf{K}^T \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{v})^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu} \otimes \mathbf{I}_n)(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{h})\right)$
  Sample $\mathbf{w} \sim \mathbf{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}, \hat{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1})$
  $[\mathbf{E}_1^T, \ldots, \mathbf{E}_p^T]^T \leftarrow \mathbf{K}\mathbf{w}$
  for $k = 1, \ldots, p$ **do**
    Sample $\mathbf{v}_k \sim GIG(-1, \mu_k^2 + \gamma_k^2, (\mathbf{E}_k + \mathbf{h}_k\mu)^2 + \mathbf{h}_k^2\boldsymbol{\gamma}_k^2)$
  end for
  $\mathbf{v} \leftarrow [\mathbf{v}_1^T, \ldots, \mathbf{v}_p^T]^T$
  return $\{\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v}\}$
end procedure

6.2 Spatial prediction

In geostatistical applications one is often interested in computing the marginal posterior distributions of the latent field given data, which is sometimes referred to as probabilistic prediction. Assuming that the kth variable should be predicted at some location $\mathbf{s}_0$, one needs the distribution $\pi_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(x_k(\mathbf{s}_0)|\mathbf{y})$, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ are estimates of the model parameters. The posterior distribution is often summarized using a point estimate and some measure of uncertainty. The most commonly used point estimate is the classical kriging predictor, which is given by $\hat{x}_k^1(\mathbf{s}_0) = \mathsf{E}(x_k(\mathbf{s}_0)|\mathbf{y})$. To compute kriging predictors for the model in equation (15), let $\mathbf{A}_p = [\varphi_1(\mathbf{s}_0), \ldots, \varphi_n(\mathbf{s}_0)]$ and introduce the posterior mean and precision matrix for $\mathbf{w}$,

$$\hat{\mathbf{Q}} = \mathsf{V}(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{v})^{-1} = \mathbf{K}^T \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{v})^{-1}\mathbf{K} + \sum_{k=1}^{p} \frac{1}{\sigma_k^2}\mathbf{A}_k^T\mathbf{A}_k, \tag{18}$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = \mathsf{E}(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{v}) = \hat{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{p} \frac{1}{\sigma_k^2}\mathbf{A}_k^T\mathbf{y}_k + \mathbf{K}^T \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{v})^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu} \otimes \mathbf{I}_n)(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{h})\right). \tag{19}$$

We then have that $\hat{x}_k^1(\mathbf{s}_0) = \mathbf{A}_p\mathsf{E}(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{A}_p\mathsf{E}_{\mathbf{v}}(\mathsf{E}_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{v})) \approx \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{A}_p\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(i)}$, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(i)}$ denotes the posterior mean (19) based on a sample $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ from the posterior distribution $\pi_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{y})$, which is obtained using the Gibbs sampler in Algorithm 1.

The kriging predictor is the point estimator that minimizes the squared loss, which means that it can be obtained as $\hat{x}_k^1(\mathbf{s}_0) = \arg\min_x \mathsf{E}((x_k(\mathbf{s}_0) - x)^2|\mathbf{y})$. However, it is not clear that the posterior mean is the most appropriate point estimator if the posterior distribution is asymmetric. One alternative would be to use the mode of the posterior distribution. Another alternative is to use the posterior median, $\hat{x}_k^2(\mathbf{s}_0) = \mathsf{med}(x_k(\mathbf{s}_0)|\mathbf{y})$, which minimizes the absolute loss. A MC estimate of the posterior median can be obtained as the sample median of samples from the Gibbs sampler in Algorithm 1.

The most common measure of uncertainty of the predictive distribution is the posterior variance. As discussed in Wallin and Bolin (2015), the kriging variance can be estimated as $\mathsf{V}(x_k(\mathbf{s}_0)|\mathbf{y}) \approx \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbf{A}_p^T(\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^{,(i)})^{-1}\mathbf{A}_p$, where $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^{(i)}$ denotes the posterior precision (18) based on a sample $\mathbf{v}^{(i)}$ from the posterior distribution $\pi_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{y})$.

6.3 Evaluation of predictive performance

One of the most popular methods for evaluating the performance of probabilistic prediction is to use the (negatively oriented) continuous ranked probability score (CRPS) (Matheson and

Winkler, 1976). This is a proper scoring rule defined by $\text{CRPS}(F, y) = \int (F(x) - \mathbb{I}(x \geq y))^2 dx$, where F denotes a marginal cumulative predictive distribution function for the model, x denotes the observed value, and $\mathbb{I}$ is an indicator function. The definition is usually difficult to use directly for computation. However, one can show that an equivalent expression is

$$\text{CRPS}(F, y) = \mathsf{E}(|X_1 - y|) - \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{E}(|X_1 - X_2|) \tag{20}$$

where the expectations are taken under the distribution F. For a Gaussian distribution this expression can be used to derive CRPS value analytically (see e.g. Gneiting and Raftery, 2007). For the multivariate NIG random fields, one option is to approximate the expected values in (20) by MC integration, and thus approximate $\text{CRPS}(F, y)$ by

$$\overline{\text{CRPS}}_N(F, y) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} |X_1^{(i)} - y| - \frac{1}{2N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} |X_1^{(i)} - X_2^{(i)}|,$$

where $X_1^{(i)}$ and $X_2^{(i)}$ are independent draws from the predictive distribution. Unfortunately, the MC variance of this predictor is often large, and N therefore often needs to be large for the approximation to be close to the true CRPS value. This is problematic in cases when it is expensive to sample the predictive distribution, which can be the case when for large datasets. However, the following proposition provides a more efficient way of approximating the CRPS value in the case of a normal-variance mixture distribution.

Theorem 6.1. *Assume that the cumulative distribution function for a random variable X is $F(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{x} \int \pi(z|v)\pi(v)dv\,dz$, where $\pi(z|v)$ is the density for the $\mathsf{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ distribution. Let $V_j^{(i)}, j = 1, 2, i = 1, \ldots, N$ be independent draws from $\pi(V)$ and define $\mu_j^{(i)} = \mathsf{E}(X|V_j^{(i)})$ and $(\sigma_j^{(i)})^2 = \mathsf{V}(X|V_j^{(i)})$. Further, let*

$$M(\mu, \sigma^2) = 2\sigma\varphi\left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right) + \mu\left(2\Phi\left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma}\right) - 1\right), \tag{21}$$

where φ and Φ denote the probability density function and the cumulative distribution function of the standard Gaussian distribution. Then

$$\overline{CRPS}_N^{RB}(F, y) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left[M\left(\mu_1^{(i)} - y, (\sigma_1^{(i)})^2\right) - \frac{1}{2}M\left(\mu_1^{(i)} - \mu_2^{(i)}, (\sigma_1^{(i)})^2 + (\sigma_2^{(i)})^2\right)\right] \tag{22}$$

satisfies $\mathsf{E}(\overline{CRPS}_N^{RB}(F, y)) = CRPS(F, y)$ and $\mathsf{V}(\overline{CRPS}_N^{RB}(F, y)) \leq \mathsf{V}(\overline{CRPS}_N(F, y))$.

See Section B.6 for a proof. For the Multivariate NIG Matérn fields, we can use the $\overline{\text{CRPS}}_N^{RB}$ estimator since the marginal posterior distributions for the field given the variance components are Gaussian and since we easily can sample the marginal posterior distributions for variance components using Gibbs sampling, as described in Section 6.2. Specifically, we take $\mu^{(i)} = \mathbf{A}_p\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^{(i)}$ and $\sigma^{(i)} = \mathbf{A}_p^T(\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^{(i)})^{-1}\mathbf{A}_p$.

To give an idea of the size of the improvement that can be obtained in using the RB estimator instead of the standard MC estimator, both estimators were used to estimate the CRPS value for the final fold of the NG General model in the cross-validation study in Section 7. Based on 10000 samples, the MC variances of the two estimators were estimated to $\mathsf{V}(\sqrt{N}\overline{\text{CRPS}}_N^{RB}(F, y)) \approx 187$ and $\mathsf{V}(\sqrt{N}\overline{\text{CRPS}}_N(F, y)) \approx 2225$. This means that one needs to take $N \approx 222000$ to obtain a CRPS estimate with a standard error of 0.1 if the standard estimator is used, whereas it is enough to use $N \approx 18700$ for the RB estimator.



Figure 3: Measurement of pressure (left) and temperature (right) in the North American Pacific Northwest together with the mesh used for the SPDE models.

Model	β_P	β_T	σ_P	σ_T	κ_P	κ_T	ν_P	ν_T	ρ	σ_{Pe}	σ_{Te}
Independent	136	-0.53	218	2.64	5.54	0.89	20	0.58	-	71.8	0.00
Parsimonious	150	-0.48	216	2.56	1.03	1.03	1.36	0.60	-0.46	68.5	0.00

Table 1: Parameter estimates for the two covariance-based models. For the independent model, the value of ν_P was limited to the interval $0 \leq \nu_p \leq 20$ for numerical stability.

7 Application

We illustrate how the multivariate NIG Matérn fields can be used by applying them to the meteorological dataset considered by both (Gneiting et al., 2012) and Apanasovich et al. (2012). The dataset, shown in Figure 3, consists of temperature and pressure observations at 157 locations in the North American Pacific Northwest.

The bivariate observations $\mathbf{y}_i = (y_{Pi}, y_{Ti})^T$, where y_{Pi} denotes pressure and y_{Ti} denotes temperature, are modeled as $\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s}_i) + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$, where $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s}) = (x_P(\mathbf{s}), x_T(\mathbf{s}))^T$ is a bivariate Matérn field with mean $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_P, \beta_T)^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i$ are independent bivariate Gaussian variables with a diagonal covariance matrix $\text{diag}(\sigma^2_{Pe}, \sigma^2_{Te})$. As a baseline model, we assume that x_P and x_T are independent Gaussian Matérn fields with covariance functions $C_{PP}(\mathbf{h}) = \sigma^2_P M(\mathbf{h} \mid \kappa_P, \nu_P)$ and $C_{TT}(\mathbf{h}) = \sigma^2_T M(\mathbf{h} \mid \kappa_T, \nu_T)$. The second model we test for $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$ is the parsimonious bivariate Gaussian Matérn field by (Gneiting et al., 2012). This model has marginal covariance functions as in the first model, but with $\kappa_P = \kappa_T = \kappa$, as well as a cross-covariance $C_{PT}(\mathbf{h}) = \rho\sigma_P\sigma_T M(\mathbf{h} \mid \kappa, (\nu_P + \nu_T)/2)$.

Using numerical maximisation of the log-likelihood function to estimate the parameters for the two covariance-based models results in the parameter estimates shown in Table 1. The main reason for the differences between our parameter estimates and those by Gneiting et al. (2012) and Apanasovich et al. (2012) is the fact that we model the mean of the fields differently. We estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ jointly with the other model parameters, whereas Gneiting et al. (2012) assumed $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$. Also Apanasovich et al. (2012) assumed $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$, but they estimated the models to data standardised by the sample means, which are 0.14 and 94.61 for temperature and pressure respectively. The reason for estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ jointly with the other parameters is that the comparison with NIG models otherwise could be considered to be unfair, since the NIG model allow for skewness that could capture some of the effects that cause the non-zero sample means of the data.

Model	β_P	β_T	σ_P	σ_T	κ_P	κ_T	ρ	σ_{Pe}	σ_{Te}	a	μ_P	γ_P
GG Diagonal	154	−0.56	284	2.30	0.74	1.10	(0)	61.4	0.57	–	–	–
GG Upper	149	−0.51	277	1.96	0.82	1.26	−0.52	60.5	0.52	(1)	–	–
NG Diagonal	159	−0.55	393	2.30	0.72	1.11	(0)	43.3	0.58	–	0.00	0.25
NG Upper	148	−0.50	293	1.94	0.78	1.27	−0.31	42.6	0.53	(1)	−0.06	0.39
NG Lower	152	−0.56	317	2.55	0.83	1.14	−0.49	41.0	0.54	(0)	−0.01	0.29
NG General	149	−0.52	309	2.11	0.80	1.20	−0.42	41.9	0.52	0.23	−0.03	0.31

Table 2: Parameter estimates for the SPDE models. Dashes indicates that the parameters are not present in the model and values in parentheses indicate that the values are not estimated. GG denotes that Gaussian noise is used for both variables whereas NG denotes that NIG noise is used for pressure while Gaussian noise is used for temperature. The marginal standard deviations of the two fields are denoted by σ_P and σ_T, and ρ denotes the cross-correlation of the fields. These values were computed from the model parameters.

Next, we fit a number of different bivariate SPDE-based models to the data. The mesh that is used for the discretization of these models, consisting of 981 nodes for the basis functions, is shown in Figure 3 and was built using the `R-INLA` package. For all SPDE models, all α parameters are fixed to 2, which corresponds to assuming $\nu = 1$ for the smoothness of the Matérn covariances. The parameter estimates for all SPDE models are shown in Table 2. First, two Gaussian models specified using (11) are estimated using numerical maximization of the log-likelihood. The first model has $D = 0$, which makes the two variables independent and we refer to this as the diagonal model. The second model is am upper-triangular model where D is estimated together with the other parameters. The variance of the measurement noise for temperature is quite small for all Gaussian models, whereas the measurement noise for pressure is a bit larger in comparison to the variance of the latent field. The reason for this is that there are several observation locations that have quite different pressure observations even though they are in close spatial proximity. Some of this short-range variation could possibly could be captured by the latent field if a non-Gaussian model was used. Thus, as a final set of models, we consider bivariate SPDE models where the driving noise for the pressure is NIG with parameters μ_P and γ_P, whereas the driving noise for temperature is kept Gaussian for simplicity.

The non-Gaussian versions of the diagonal and upper-triangular models are estimated using the gradient descent method described in Section 6.1. In Table 2, one can note that the estimated correlation between the variables is lower in the NIG model than in the corresponding Gaussian model, which could suggest that the model fit is poor. This could be caused by the fact that an upper-triangular operator in inappropriate for this data. Therefore, we also test the lower-triangular and general operators described in Section 4. In Table 2, one can note that the resulting correlation indeed is higher than in the upper-triangular model. For the general model, the shape parameter a is estimated jointly with the other model parameters. The estimated value is 0.23, which corresponds to an operator that is neither upper-triangular nor lower-triangular, but that is more similar to a lower-triangular operator. Figure 4 show marginal distributions for the general and upper-triangular NIG models, together with the marginal distributions of the Gaussian triangular model.

To compare the different models, we perform a leave-one-out pseudo cross-validation study. For each observation location, the pressure and temperature values are predicted using the data from all 156 other locations using the models with parameters shown in Table 2. For all models, the point estimates are computed using the expected values of the values at the held out location conditionally on the data at all other locations. Using the posterior median as a predictor did not improve the predictive performance for this data, and we therefore omit



Figure 4: The upper panels show bivariate marginal distributions of the Gaussian triangular model (left), NIG-Gaussian general (mid), and NIG-Gaussian upper-triangular (right). The lower panels show the corresponding univariate marginal distributions.

those results. The predictive performance of the models is assessed using the median absolute error of the 157 predicted values, as well as the median CRPS. The resulting values are shown in Table 3. One can note that all models have similar performance for temperature, whereas the NIG models have better predictive performance than the Gaussian models for pressure. Kriging predictions using the parsimonious bivariate Matérn model and the general NIG model can be seen in Figure 5.

8 Discussion

There is a need for practically useful random field models with more general distributions than the Gaussian. Especially for multivariate data, finding good alternatives to the Gaussian fields has been considered as an open problem in the literature (Genton and Kleiber, 2015). We have introduced one such alternative by formulating a new class of multivariate random fields with flexible multivariate marginal distributions and covariance functions of Matérn-type. The fields are constructed as solutions to SPDEs and can easily be applied and fitted in a geostatistical setting by using a computationally efficient likelihood-based estimation method. In fact, the models have the same computational advantages as their Gaussian counterparts, which allows for applications to large datasets, although with additional cost due to MC sampling. This combination of flexibility and computational efficiency should make the model class an attractive alternative to Gaussian models in geostatistical applications.

The proposed multivariate models have marginal Matérn covariances, but the cross-covariance functions are not in the Matérn class. Instead, two variables in the model with spectral densities S_i and S_j of Matérn type will have a cross-power spectrum that is proportional to $\sqrt{S_i S_j}$. The corresponding covariance function could be viewed as a natural extension of the Matérn class, and this form of the cross-power spectrum has the benefit that there are no difficult-to-check restrictions on the model parameters, as for the standard covariance-based multivariate



Figure 5: Kriging estimates of pressure (top) and temperature (bottom) using the bivariate parsimonious Matérn model and the general NIG model. To simplify comparison, the estimates using the parsimonious Matérn model are computed at the mesh nodes for the NIG model. The right column shows the differences between the two estimates.

Matérn models. Furthermore, both Gneiting et al. (2012) and Apanasovich et al. (2012) highlighted that the most important aspect of the multivariate models is to allow for flexibility in the marginal covariances while still allowing for some degree of cross-covariance. Therefore, we believe the particular form of the cross-covariance function should be sufficient for most applications where multivariate Matérn fields are used.

So far, the computational benefits obtained by using the SPDE approach are only available for random fields with certain smoothness parameters. This is often viewed as one of the main restrictions of the SPDE approach, since the smoothness of the covariance function is important for the predictive performance of the models. However, it should be noted that the distributional assumptions in many cases can be as important. This was clearly shown in the application where the covariance-based models, which allow for different smoothness of all components, were outperformed by the non-Gaussian models with fixed smoothness parameters. Nevertheless, extending the approach so that covariances with different smoothness parameter can be approximated is an interesting topic for future research. Other directions of future research includes extending the models to allow for even more general marginal distributions, which for example can be done by considering equations driven by generalized asymmetric Laplace noise.

References

Andrieu, C., Moulines, É., Priouret, P., 2005. Stability of stochastic approximation under verifiable conditions. SIAM J. Control Optim. 44 (1), 283–312.

Apanasovich, T. V., Genton, M. G., Sun, Y., 2012. A valid matérn class of cross-covariance functions for multivariate random fields with any number of components. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 107 (497), 180–193.

Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E., 1997. Normal inverse gaussian distributions and stochastic volatility modelling. Scand. J. Statist. 24 (1), 1–13.

Model	Number of parameters	Pressure (Pascal)		Temperature (degrees Celcius)	
		MAE	CRPS	MAE	CRPS
Independent	10	40.585	26.546	0.956	0.598
Parsimonious	10	39.068	27.682	0.921	0.576
GG Diagonal	8	38.624	31.711	0.917	0.594
GG Upper	9	38.856	31.829	0.915	0.580
NG Diagonal	10	37.404	26.231	0.917	0.594
NG Upper	11	38.333	25.823	0.917	0.576
NG Lower	11	**37.280**	25.859	**0.898**	0.557
NG General	12	37.928	**25.510**	0.911	**0.555**

Table 3: The number of parameters for the different models as well as co-kriging cross-validation results comparing the median absolute error (MAE) and median continuous ranked probability score (CRPS). The best value for each column is indicated with bold script.

Bolin, D., 2014. Spatial Matérn fields driven by non-Gaussian noise. Scand. J. Statist. 41, 557–579.

Bolin, D., Lindgren, F., 2011. Spatial models generated by nested stochastic partial differential equations, with an application to global ozone mapping. Ann. Appl. Statist. 5 (1), 523–550.

Bolin, D., Lindgren, F., 2013. A comparison between Markov approximations and other methods for large spatial data sets. Comput. Statist. and Data Anal. 61, 7–21.

Du, J., Leonenko, N., Ma, C., Shu, H., 2012. Hyperbolic vector random fields with hyperbolic direct and cross covariance functions. Stoch. Anal. Appl. 30 (4), 662–674.

Genton, M. G., Kleiber, W., 2015. Cross-covariance functions for multivariate geostatistics. Statist. Science 30 (2), 147–163.

Genton, M. G., Padoan, S. A., Sang, H., 2015. Multivariate max-stable spatial processes. Biometrika, asu066.

Gneiting, T., Kleiber, W., Schlather, M., 2012. Matérn cross-covariance functions for multivariate random fields. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.

Gneiting, T., Raftery, A. E., 2007. Strictly proper scoring rules, prediction, and estimation. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 102 (477), 359–378.

Hu, X., Lindgren, D. S., Rue, H., et al., 2013. Multivariate gaussian random fields using systems of stochastic partial differential equations. arXiv preprint arXiv:1307.1379.

Hu, X., Steinsland, I., 2016. Spatial modeling with system of stochastic partial differential equations. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Comput. Statist. 8 (2), 112–125.

Jørgensen, B., 1982. Statistical properties of the generalized inverse Gaussian distribution. Lecture Notes in Statistics. Springer-Verlag.

Kushner, H. J., Yin, G., 2003. Stochastic approximation and recursive algorithms and applications. Vol. 35. Springer Science & Business Media.

Lindgren, F., Rue, H., 2015. Bayesian spatial modelling with R-INLA. J. Statist. Software 63 (19).

Lindgren, F., Rue, H., Lindström, J., 2011. An explicit link between Gaussian fields and Gaussian Markov random fields: the stochastic partial differential equation approach (with discussion). J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B Stat. Methodol. 73, 423–498.

Ma, C., 2013a. Mittag-leffler vector random fields with mittag-leffler direct and cross covariance functions. Ann. Inst. of Statist. Math. 65 (5), 941–958.

Ma, C., 2013b. Student's t vector random fields with power-law and log-law decaying direct and cross covariances. Stoch. Anal. Appl. 31 (1), 167–182.

Matérn, B., 1960. Spatial variation. Meddelanden från statens skogsforskningsinstitut 49 (5).

Matheson, J. E., Winkler, R. L., 1976. Scoring rules for continuous probability distributions. Management science 22 (10), 1087–1096.

MATLAB, 2015. 8.6.0.267246 (R2015b). The MathWorks Inc., Natick, Massachusetts.

Rajput, B. S., Rosinski, J., 1989. Spectral representations of infinitely divisible processes. Probab. Theory Related Fields 82 (3), 451–487.

Rosiński, J., 1991. On a class of infinitely divisible processes represented as mixtures of Gaussian processes. In: Stable Processes and Related Topics. Vol. 25 of Progress in Probability. Birkhauser, Boston, pp. 27–41.

Rue, H., Held, L., 2005. Gaussian Markov Random Fields; Theory and Applications. Vol. 104 of Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL.

Rue, H., Martino, S., 2007. Approximate Bayesian inference for hierarchical Gaussian Markov random field models. J. Statist. Plann. and Inference 137 (10), 3177–3192.

Wallin, J., Bolin, D., 2015. Geostatistical modelling using non-Gaussian Matérn fields. Scand. J. Statist. 42, 872–890.

Wei, G. C., Tanner, M. A., 1990. A monte carlo implementation of the em algorithm and the poor man's data augmentation algorithms. J. Amer. Statist. Assoc. 85 (1), 699–704.

A Gradients of the log-likelihood

In this section, the gradients needed for the stochastic gradient estimation of the multivariate model presented in Section 6 are presented. To simplify notation, we introduce the variables $[\hat{\mathbf{E}}_1^T, \ldots, \hat{\mathbf{E}}_p^T]^T = \mathbf{K}\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ is the posterior mean from equation (19). The parameters we need to compute the gradients for are μ_k, γ_k and σ_k for $k = 1, \ldots, p$, as well as the regression parameters $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and the parameters of the differential operator matrix $\mathbf{K}$. All gradients are obtained by first computing $\pi(\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ by integrating out $\mathbf{w}$ from

$$\begin{aligned}\log \pi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}|\mathbf{y}) = &\sum_{k=1}^{p} \left(-m \log \sigma_k - \frac{1}{2\sigma_j^2} \left(\mathbf{y}_k - \mathbf{A}_k\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^T \left(\mathbf{y}_k - \mathbf{A}_k\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\beta}\right) \right) \\ &- \frac{1}{2} \left(\mathbf{K}\mathbf{w} - (\boldsymbol{\mu} \otimes \mathbf{I}_n)(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{h})\right)^T \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{v})^{-1} \left(\mathbf{K}\mathbf{w} - (\boldsymbol{\mu} \otimes \mathbf{I}_n)(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{h})\right) \\ &+ |\mathbf{K}| + \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\log \gamma_k - 2 \log v_i^k - \frac{(h_i^k \gamma_k)^2}{2v_i^k} - \frac{\gamma_k^2}{2} v_i^k + h_i^k \gamma_k^2 \right).\end{aligned}$$

This is straightforward to do since $\mathbf{w}|\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{y}$ is Gaussian. Standard matrix calculus is then used to differentiate $\log \pi(\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ with respect to the parameters to obtain the required gradients. For brevity we omit all details and just present the results.

The gradients for the noise parameters μ_k and γ_k, the measurement noise variances σ_k, and the regression parameters are

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{\mu_k} \log \pi(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= (-\mathbf{h}_k + \mathbf{v}_k)^T \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{v}_k)^{-1} \left(\hat{\mathbf{E}} - (-\mathbf{h}_k + \mathbf{v}_k)\, \mu_k \right), \\
\nabla_{\gamma_k} \log \pi(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \frac{n}{\gamma_k} - \left(\mathbf{v}_k + \mathbf{h}_k^2 \cdot \mathbf{v}_k^{-1} \right) \mathbf{1}\gamma_k + \mathbf{h}_k^T \mathbf{1}\gamma_k \\
\nabla_{\sigma_k} \log \pi(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= -\frac{n}{\sigma_k} + \frac{1}{\sigma_k^3} \left(\mathbf{y}_k - \mathbf{A}_k \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\beta} \right)^T \left(\mathbf{y}_k - \mathbf{A}_k \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\beta} \right) + \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \hat{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1}), \\
\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \log \pi(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \sum_{k=1}^{p} \frac{1}{\sigma_k^2} \left(\mathbf{y}_k - \mathbf{A}_k \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \mathbf{B}\boldsymbol{\beta} \right)^T \mathbf{B}.
\end{aligned}$$

For a parameter θ_K in the operator, the gradient can be written as

$$\nabla_{\theta_K} \log \pi(\mathbf{v}|\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{K}_{\theta_K} \mathbf{K}^{-1}) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}^T \mathbf{K}_{\theta_K}^T \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{v})^{-1} \mathbf{K} \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} - \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{K}_{\theta_K}^T \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{v})^{-1} \mathbf{K} \hat{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1}),$$

where $\operatorname{tr}(\cdot)$ denotes the matrix trace, and where $\mathbf{K}_{\theta_K}$ denotes the derivative of $\mathbf{K}$ with respect to θ_K. Using that $\mathbf{K}$ is on the form given in equation (14), one gets

$$\mathbf{K}_{\theta_K} = \begin{cases}
(\mathbf{D}_{\theta_K} \otimes \mathbf{I}_n) \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{L}_{\alpha_1}(\tau_1, \kappa_1), \ldots, \mathbf{L}_{\alpha_p}(\tau_p, \kappa_p)) & \text{if } \theta_K \text{ is a parameter for } \mathbf{D}, \\
(\mathbf{D}_p \otimes \mathbf{I}_n)(\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{C}^{-1}\mathbf{G} + \kappa_j^2 \mathbf{I})^{\frac{\alpha_j}{2}} \otimes \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{e}_j)) & \text{if } \theta_K = \tau_j, \\
(\mathbf{D} \otimes \mathbf{I}_n)(\tau_j \kappa_j \alpha_j \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{C}^{-1}\mathbf{G} + \kappa_j^2 \mathbf{I})^{\frac{\alpha_j}{2}-1} \otimes \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{e}_j)) & \text{if } \theta_K = \kappa_j,
\end{cases}$$

where $\mathbf{D}_{\theta_K}$ is the derivative of $\mathbf{D}$ with respect to θ_K.

To take full advantage of the sparsity of the matrices, one should compute $\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A} \hat{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1})$ and $\operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{K}_{\theta_K}^T \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{v})^{-1} \mathbf{K} \hat{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1})$ without inverting $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$. To do so, we note both $\mathbf{A}^T \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{K}_{\theta_K}^T \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{v})^{-1} \mathbf{K}$ are sparse matrices with non-zero elements only at positions in the matrices where also $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$ is non-zero. This means that it is enough to compute the elements of $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}^{-1}$ only at the positions where $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$ is non-zero, which can be done efficiently using the method by Rue and Martino (2007).

B Technical details and proofs

In this section, we clarify some mathematical details regarding the SPDE models and then present the proofs of the propositions in the article.

On $\mathbb{R}^d$, the fractional operator $(\kappa^2 - \Delta)^{\alpha/2}$ is defined (see Lindgren et al., 2011) through the Fourier transform, $(\mathcal{F}(\kappa^2 - \Delta)^{\alpha/2}\phi)(\mathbf{k}) = (\kappa^2 + \|\mathbf{k}\|)^{\alpha/2}(\mathcal{F}\phi)(\mathbf{k})$. The operator is well-defined for example if ϕ is a tempered distribution, which is important for the definition of the SPDE in Equation (2). The reason for this is that the right-hand side of the SPDE is white noise, which does not have pointwise meaning. Thus, the equation can only be understood in the weak sense,

$$(\kappa^2 - \Delta)^{\alpha/2} X(\varphi) = \dot{M}(\varphi)$$

where φ is a function in some appropriate space of test functions, and $\dot{M}(\varphi) = \int \varphi(\mathbf{s}) M(\,\mathrm{d}\mathbf{s})$.

As mentioned in Section 2, the kernel of the operator $\mathcal{K} = (\kappa^2 - \Delta)^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ is non-trivial for $\alpha \geq 2$ and there is an implicit assumption of boundary conditions in the equation as we are only interested in the stationary solutions. An alternative approach is to replace the operator $\tilde{\mathcal{K}}$ with a version of the operator that is restricted to $\operatorname{Ker}(\mathcal{K})^{\perp}$. This also allows us to talk about the inverse of the operator, which otherwise would have to be replaced with a Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse. Since we are only interested in stationary fields, we will take this approach for

all operators throughout the paper. Thus, for any operator we will use we implicitly mean the operator restricted to the orthogonal complement of its kernel.

Although the Matérn SPDE can only be understood in the weak sense, one can show that almost surely X is a Hölder continuous function, $X \in C_k^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ where k is the integer part of $\nu - d/2$ and $r = \nu - d/2 - k$. Thus, we can think of X as a regular function with pointwise meaning if $\nu > d/2$ in general, or if $\nu > 0$ if the driving noise is Gaussian. We refer to Appendix A in (Bolin, 2014) for a detailed discussion of this.

B.1 Proof of Proposition 2.2

The operator matrix in Equation (7) can be written as $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{K}} = \mathbf{D}_u \operatorname{diag}(\mathcal{L}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_p)$. Let

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{k}) = \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{K}})(\mathbf{k}) = \mathbf{D}_u \mathcal{F}(\operatorname{diag}(\mathcal{L}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_p)) = \mathbf{D}_u \boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}}_D(\mathbf{k}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}}_D(\mathbf{k})$ is a diagonal matrix with elements that are obtained directly from the definition of the Matérn operator, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}}_D(\mathbf{k})_{ii} = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{L}_i) = \tau_i(\kappa_i^2 + \|\mathbf{k}\|)^{\alpha_i/2}$. Having introduced this notation, we can write the power spectrum of $\mathbf{x}$ as $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{k}) = \mathsf{E}(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x})\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x})^T) = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbf{k})^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{W}}(\mathbf{k})\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{k})^{-T}$, where $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{W}}$ is the power spectrum of driving noise, which is $(2\pi)^{-d}\mathbf{I}$ due to the independence of the noise processes. Thus,

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{k}) = (2\pi)^{-d}\mathcal{H}_D(\mathbf{k})^{-1}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{R}^T\mathcal{H}_D(\mathbf{k})^{-1}. \tag{23}$$

Evaluating a single element of $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{k})$ gives

$$(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{k}))_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^p R_{ik}R_{jk}}{(2\pi)^d\tau_i\tau_j}\frac{1}{(\kappa_i^2 + \|\mathbf{k}\|)^{\alpha_i/2}(\kappa_j^2 + \|\mathbf{k}\|)^{\alpha_j/2}}.$$

It is well-known that (Lindgren et al., 2011)

$$\mathcal{F}^{-1}\left(\frac{\sigma^2\Gamma(\alpha)\kappa^{2\nu}}{\Gamma(\nu)\pi^{d/2}}\frac{1}{(\kappa^2 + \|\mathbf{k}\|)^{\alpha}}\right)(\mathbf{h}) = \sigma^2 C_\nu^\kappa(\mathbf{h}).$$

Thus, to obtain marginal Matérn covariances with variance σ_i^2, we need that

$$\frac{\sum_{k=1}^p R_{ik}^2}{(2\pi)^d\tau_i^2} = \frac{\sigma_i^2\Gamma(\alpha_i)\kappa_i^{2\nu_i}}{\Gamma(\nu_i)\pi^{d/2}}.$$

Solving for τ_i gives the desired result. □

B.2 Proof of Proposition 2.3

That $\mathbf{x}$ has Matérn covariances if the assumptions of the proposition are valid follows by the same argument that was used in the proof of Proposition 2.2. The only difference is that $\mathbf{D}_u$ is replaced by $\mathbf{D}$, and we will therefore not repeat it here. Going through the argument also gives the desired form of the cross-spectrum. Finally, that Gaussian models satisfying $\mathbf{D}^T\mathbf{D} = \hat{\mathbf{D}}^T\hat{\mathbf{D}}$ are equivalent follows directly from the fact that the power spectrum for $\mathbf{x}$, given in Equation (23) depends on $\mathbf{D}$ only through the expression $\mathbf{R}\mathbf{R}^T = (\mathbf{D}^T\mathbf{D})^{-1}$. □

B.3 Proof of Corollary 2.4

The vector-valued noise process can be written as $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\Sigma = \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$. Thus, the power spectrum of the noise process is $\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{W}_\Sigma} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{W}}\mathbf{R}^T = (2\pi)^{-d}\mathbf{I}$, and the power spectrum of the solution to the system $\operatorname{diag}(\mathcal{L}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_p)\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s}) = \boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\Sigma$ is

$$\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{k}) = \mathcal{H}_D(\mathbf{k})^{-1}\mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{W}_\Sigma}(\mathbf{k})\mathcal{H}_D(\mathbf{k})^{-1} = (2\pi)^{-d}\mathcal{H}_D(\mathbf{k})^{-1}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{R}^T(\mathbf{k})\mathcal{H}_D(\mathbf{k})^{-1}.$$

This is the same power spectrum as that of the multivariate SPDE-field with marginal Matérn covariances, given in Equation (23). The representation of $\mathbf{x}$ as the solution of p one-dimensional systems follows directly from the fact that $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}_\Sigma = \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{W}}$. □

B.4 Proof of Proposition 3.2

That the variables $x_1(\mathbf{s})$ and $x_2(\mathbf{s})$ are dependent follows directly by construction. Thus it remains to show that $\mathrm{Cov}(x_1(\mathbf{s}), x_2(\mathbf{t})) = 0$. From (Bolin, 2014) we have that

$$x_1(\mathbf{s}) = \int G_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{v}) \boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}_{R,1}(d\mathbf{v}),\; x_2(\mathbf{t}) = \int G_2(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{v}) \boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}_{R,2}(d\mathbf{v}),$$

where $G_j(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{v})$ is the Green function of $\mathcal{L}_j$, and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}_{R,i}(\mathbf{s})$ is the ith value of the vector $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}_R(\mathbf{s})$ defined in equation (10). By Fubini's theorem,

$$\mathrm{Cov}(x_1(\mathbf{s}), x_2(\mathbf{t})) = \int \int G_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{v}_1) G_2(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{v}_2) \,\mathrm{Cov}\left(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}_{R,1}(\mathbf{v}_1), \boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}_{R,2}(\mathbf{v}_2)\right) d\mathbf{v}_1 d\mathbf{v}_2.$$

Because any pair of variables $Z_{k,i}$ and $Z_{m,j}$ in $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}_R(.)$ are independent if $i \neq j$ it follows that $\mathrm{Cov}\left(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}_{R,1}(\mathbf{v}_1), \boldsymbol{\mathcal{M}}_{R,2}(\mathbf{v}_2)\right) = 0$, and thus $\mathrm{Cov}(x_1(\mathbf{s}), x_2(\mathbf{t})) = 0$.

B.5 Proof of Proposition 3.3

The characteristic function of the univariate NIG noise $\dot{\mathcal{N}}(A)$ is given by

$$\phi_{\dot{\mathcal{N}}(A)}(u) = \exp\left(i\delta m(A)u + m(A)\gamma\left(\gamma - \sqrt{\gamma^2 + \sigma^2 u^2 - 2i\mu u}\right)\right). \tag{24}$$

From (Bolin, 2014), we have that the solution of the SPDE of for $p = 1$ can be written as $x(\mathbf{s}) = \int G_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) \mathcal{N}(d\mathbf{t})$, where the kernel is given by the Green's function of the operator $\mathcal{L}_1$, which is

$$G_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_1 - d}{2}\right)}{(4\pi)^{d/2}\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_1}{2})\kappa_1^{\alpha_1 - d}} M\left(\|\mathbf{s} - \mathbf{t}\| \mid \kappa_1,\, \frac{\alpha_1 - d}{2}\right).$$

Using the characteristic function of the noise (24) and Proposition 2.6 in (Rajput and Rosinski, 1989) it follows that the characteristic function of $x(\mathbf{s})$ in the univariate case is

$$\phi_{x(\mathbf{s})}(u) = \exp\left(-i\delta u \int G_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} + \sigma\gamma \int (\frac{\gamma^2}{\sigma^2} - \sqrt{\frac{\gamma^2}{\sigma^2} + \frac{\mu^2}{\sigma^4} - (\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} + iG_1(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t})u)^2} d\mathbf{t}\right).$$

To generate the marginal densities of $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s})$ for $p > 1$, note use Corollary 2.4 which shows that the SPDE equivalently can be written as

$$\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{k=1}^{p} \mathrm{diag}(\mathcal{L}_1^{-1}, \ldots, \mathcal{L}_p^{-1}) \mathcal{W}_k(\mathbf{s}) \begin{bmatrix} R_{1k}, & \cdots & R_{pk} \end{bmatrix}^T.$$

where the p terms on the right hand side are independent random variables. It follows that the characteristic function of the kth term on the right hand side, $\phi_k(\mathbf{x})$, has the form given in the formulation of the proposition. Using this together with that the terms are independent gives the desired result. □

B.6 Proof of Proposition 6.1

If $X \sim \mathsf{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$, then $|X|$ has a folded normal distribution with mean function $M(\mu, \sigma^2)$ defined by equation (21). Let X_1 and X_2 be two independent variance mixture variables with cumulative distribution function F and let V_1 and V_2 be their corresponding mixing variables. Introduce $\tilde{X}_1 = X_1 - y$ and $\tilde{X}_2 = X_1 - X_2$ and note that there exist variables μ_1, μ_2, σ_1^2, and σ_2^2,

depending on V_1 and V_2, such that $\tilde{X}_1|V_1 \sim \mathsf{N}(\mu_1 - y, \sigma_1^2)$ and $\tilde{X}_2|V_1, V_2 \sim \mathsf{N}(\mu_1 - \mu_2, \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2)$. By the law of total expectation

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{CRPS}(F, y) &= \mathsf{E}(|\tilde{X}_1|) - \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{E}(|\tilde{X}_2|) \\
&= \mathsf{E}_{V_1}(\mathsf{E}(|X_1 - y| \mid V_1)) - \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{E}_{V_1}(\mathsf{E}_{V_2}(\mathsf{E}(|X_1 - X_2| \mid V_1, V_2))) \\
&= \mathsf{E}_{V_1}(M(\mu_1 - y, \sigma_1^2)) - \frac{1}{2}\mathsf{E}_{V_1}(\mathsf{E}_{V_2}(M(\mu_1 - \mu_2, \sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2))). \qquad (25)
\end{aligned}$$

We have that $\mathsf{E}(\overline{\mathrm{CRPS}}_N^{RB}(F, y)) = \mathrm{CRPS}(F, y)$ since $\overline{\mathrm{CRPS}}_N^{RB}(F, y)$ is a standard MC estimator of (25). Furthermore, $\overline{\mathrm{CRPS}}_N^{RB}(F, y) = \mathsf{E}(\overline{\mathrm{CRPS}}_N(F, y)|\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbf{V}_2)$ where $\mathbf{V}_j = (V_j^{(1)}, \ldots V_j^{(N)})$ for $j = 1, 2$. Thus, $\overline{\mathrm{CRPS}}_N^{RB}(F, y)$ is a Rao-Blackwell estimator and by the Law of total variation $\mathsf{V}(\overline{\mathrm{CRPS}}_N^{RB}(F, y)) \leq \mathsf{V}(\overline{\mathrm{CRPS}}_N(F, y))$. $\square$